

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

9 State of Arizona, ex rel. Kristin K. )  
10 Mayes, Attorney General; et al., )  
11 v. Plaintiffs, ) No. CIV 23-233-TUC-CKJ  
12 Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C., dba Avid )  
13 Telecom; et al., )  
14 Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
15 Pending before the Court is the Motion to Revise Discovery Schedule Pursuant to  
16 Rule 54(b) (Doc. 121). The Court has reviewed the brief and determined the Motion does  
17 not present a discovery dispute as referenced by the Court's Case Management Scheduling  
18 Order (Doc. 102, § E.4) ("Pursuant to Local Rule 7.2(j), parties must personally consult and  
19 make a sincere effort to resolve a discovery dispute before seeking the Court's assistance.  
20 If the parties are unable to resolve a discovery dispute, the parties shall notify the Court ...  
21 Written briefs shall be filed only at the direction of the Court."). The Court, therefore,  
22 accepts the Motion to Revise Discovery Schedule Pursuant to Rule 54(b). Following the  
23 time for filing a response and a reply, the Court will consider the Motion.

**ORDER**

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 DATED this 1st day of August, 2025.

26   
27 Cindy K. Jorgenson  
28 United States District Judge